

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-14 are amended, new claims 19-32 are added and claim 18 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 2-10 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action objects to the specification and claims 1, 11, 13 and 14 because of informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 11-14, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 6,118,214 to Marcotte. The Office Action also rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Marcotte. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites dummy electrodes positioned within said non-display area have a different gap between electrodes as compared to a gap between a scan electrode and a sustain electrode forming a sustain electrode pair positioned within said active area.

Marcotte does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and

Reply to Office Action dated March 24, 2006

scan contacts 60 and 62 (of FIG. 4) correspond to the claimed dummy electrodes positioned within a non-display area. Applicant respectfully submits that the extensions of the sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and the scan contacts 60 and 62 do not correspond to dummy electrodes as would be known to one skilled in the art.

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that the distance between the extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 is different from the gap between electrodes 52 and 54. However, these cited elements do not correspond to the claimed features. That is, independent claim 1 recites the dummy electrodes positioned within said non-display area have a different gap between electrodes as compared to a gap between a scan electrode and a sustain electrode forming a sustain electrode pair positioned within the active area. The Office Action's citation therefore does not correspond to these claimed features. Accordingly, the features alleged in the Office Action do not correspond to the claimed dummy electrodes. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Independent claim 11 recites dummy electrodes positioned within said non-display area have a different electrode width as compared to a width of a sustain electrode or a scan electrode forming a sustain electrode pair positioned within said active area.

Marcotte does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 11. More specifically, in addressing these features, the Office Action again references the extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and scan contacts 60 and 62 (of FIG. 4). However, for at least similar reasons as set forth above, these extensions and/or scan contacts do not correspond to the claimed dummy electrodes.

Reply to Office Action dated March 24, 2006

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that the extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and/or scan contacts 60 and 64 have a different electrode width from sustain electrode pairs positioned within the display area. However, the extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and scan contacts 60 and 62 do not correspond to the claimed dummy electrodes (as recited in independent claim 11). Accordingly, Marcotte does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 11. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 23 recites first and second electrodes extending across at least a portion of the non-active area, and at least one sustain electrode pair formed of a sustain electrode and a scan electrode, the at least one sustain electrode pair extending across at least a portion of the active area. Independent claim 23 also recites a gap between the first electrode and the second electrode is of different distance than a gap between the sustain electrode and the scan electrode forming the at least one sustain electrode pair. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Marcotte does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 23. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 28 recites first and second electrodes extending across at least a portion of the non-active area, and at least one sustain electrode pair formed of a sustain electrode and a scan electrode, the at least one sustain electrode pair extending across at least a portion of the active area, wherein a width of the first electrode is different than a width of the sustain electrode, and the width of the first electrode is different than a width of the scan electrode. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Marcotte does not teach or suggest at

least these features of independent claim 28. Thus, independent claim 28 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 11, 23 and 28 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 21 recites that each dummy electrode includes a transparent electrode and a bus electrode. See also dependent claims 3, 13, 19, 25 and 30. Marcotte's alleged extensions of sustain electrodes 52 and 54 and scan contacts 60 and 62 do not correspond to a transparent electrode and a bus electrode. Thus, dependent claims 3, 13, 19, 21, 25 and 30 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Dependent claim 22 (as well as dependent claims 20, 26 and 31) recites that address electrodes traverse the dummy electrodes and the electrodes of the sustain electrode pair. Marcotte does not teach or suggest at least these features in combination with the dummy electrodes recited in independent claim 1. Thus, dependent claims 20, 22, 26 and 31 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 and 19-32 are

Serial No. 10/657,257

Docket No. YHK-0117

Reply to Office Action dated March 24, 2006

earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah:cah

Date: June 26, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2017\2017-105\90700.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610